(MR. SPEAKER.)

and order and that the motion was therefore admissible. The Hon'ble Home Minister stated that Government had no information in the matter so far as the incident at Chitaldrug was concerned and that the matters alleged to have taken place at Tumkur were *sub judice*. He also assured the Hon'ble Member Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy and this House that the Government were interested in the maintenance of law and order irrespective of whether the trouble arose from those who advocated one or two Kannada speaking States. As I indicated even yesterday, matters which involve the ordinary administration of law cannot form the subject of an adjournment motion. This point has been repeatedly ruled in this House as well as in other Legislatures in India and elsewhere. Remedies are open to persons affected in courts of law. The matter can also be raised in this House by other means like Short Notice Questions, etc. In any case, matters involving the ordinary administration of law have usually not been permitted to supersede the appointed order of business. I therefore hold the motion as out of order.

---

(2) Alleged Dishonour to National Flag in Mysore City.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received notice of another adjournment motion. That is tabled by Sri U. M Madappa. The adjournment motion is as follows:

> "This House shall stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence, namely, the national dishonour done to the National Flag by tearing it away by some rowdies in Mysore City on 15th November 1955."

May I know from the Government whether they are in possession of any facts concerning this matter?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home).—I am in possession of facts. May I place the facts before the Hon'ble House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—On 15th November 1955 a public meeting was arranged in Mysore in the Town Hall by the sponsors of 'Mysore for Mysore', 'for retaining Mysore as it is' and that meeting was being conducted inside the Town Hall. Outside the Town Hall another meeting was arranged at about 6-45 P.M. by about 25 people consisting of, so far as my report goes, some of them—P. S. P. members. A National Flag was being held by one of them by name Sri Ananthiah. When the meeting was going on inside the Town Hall, these gentlemen who alleged that they were for one Karnataka wanted to enter into the Town Hall. Some trouble by way of verbal altercation was going on and then suddenly somebody cried out that the National Flag was snatched away by someone and it was alleged that that Flag was snatched away and dishonoured. This allegation was made by those that were conducting the meeting for Karnatak. There were two police officers on the spot. It was ascertained that the National Flag was seen by them. It was roughly 2 feet by 4 feet. As soon as that cry was made, there was another counter-cry to the effect that those people who started the procession, namely, 25—themselves removed the flag and then started saying that the Flag was snatched away by the other party. It was actually reported by the officers who were on the spot that when this altercation was going on, somebody in the crowd consisting of these 25 might have taken the Flag. At any rate, nobody observed as to who took the flag, but this is a fact that the flag was neither torn, nor taken, nor dishonoured.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Maddur).—Disappeared!

Sri H.SIDDAVEERAPPA.—After this was over, a thorough investigation was made.

1-30 P.M.

It was reported, and I have no reason to disbelieve the report of my officers, that all those allegations stating that the National Flag was dishonoured or torn or burnt are not true to facts. Sir, it is a very serious allegation to make because in

ary country the National Flag is the very soul of that country and if any body dishonours the Flag, it would be a very serious reflection. So, I was anxious to know whether there is any atom of truth in the allegation. It is rather unfortunate that in these days of emotional excitement, sometimes allegations are made and that too recklessly, I may not be far wrong if I say that, sometimes, intentionally, with a view to see that some kind of feeling of agitational nature is excited in the minds of the people. Based on these allegations, naturally, some boys, I do not say it is correct, were excited and that was the subject matter of some excitement in Mysore. But I would like to assure the Honourable House that there is no truth in the allegation that the Flag was dishonoured in the manner in which the adjournment motion states. I may also state in this Honourable House that there is a code called the Flag Code. That Code prescribes the mode and the manner in which our National Flag has to be used. So far as the public are concerned, we have made it clear in the Press Statement the Government have issued on 27th August 1954 that the National Flag can be made use of by the public only on some special occasions, namely, on accasions like the Independence Day Celebrations on 15th August, Mahatma Gandhi's Birthday, January 26th and National Week as well as on any particular day of national rejoicing, the use of the Flag will be unrestricted. I believe, it would be totally wrong for anybody to use the National Flag on any occasion other than those specified in the Press Communique. I have not been able to find whether the use of the National Flag on any other occasion except according to the Flag Code is an offence. But whatever it is, it is the duty of every citizen to see that the National Flag is not so lightly made use of and it would be better that that practice is discouraged. But so far as the present adjournment motion is concerned, I would like to make the position quite clear once again; on a thorough enquiry I have come to the conclusion that the allegations are baseless and unfounded and there is no truth in those allegations. Government are one with any other in order to see that the National Flag is fully respected by anybody.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I want some clarification May I know whether any action has been taken for the unauthorised use of the National Flag ?

Mr SPEAKER.—That is a different thing.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER —That is a different matter. The Hon'ble Member can bring an adjournment motion or some short notice question on that. I do not allow discussion now.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I want clarification from the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Every Hon'ble Member may require information or clarification. The Chair wanted some facts in order to decide whether to admit this adjournment motion or not. If I want anything more, I will ask.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—The mover of the adjournment motion may himself withdraw the adjournment motion he has given notice of. If certian points are clarified, then there would not be any need for the mover to press the adjournment motion. Therefore I wanted to know whether any action has been taken by the Government for the unauthorised use of the National Flag by any particular party.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am getting the matter examined whether there is any provision of law under which any action can be taken if the National Flag is used in any manner other than those specified in the Press Communique. That is a matter that is under examination, as I have already said.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In view of the statement made by the Hon'ble Minister that there is no truth in the Statement, what does the Hon'ble Member say ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—ಇದೇ ಮಾಹೆ 15ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಘಟನೆ ನಡೆಯಿತು. 16ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿನವೇ ತಾಯಿನಾಡು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಚುರವಾಗಿದೆ. Headlines ನಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಅಕ್ಷರದಲ್ಲಿ "ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಧ್ವಜಕ್ಕೆ ಅಗೌರವವಾಗಿದೆ"ಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಅದು ತಮ್ಮ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.)

ಅವಗಾಹನೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, enquiry ಮಾಡಿದೆವು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸೋಷಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯ ಸುಳ್ಳು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸುಳ್ಳು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು unparliamentary.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದುದು. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಏಕೀಕರಣವಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಸಮೂಹ ಸೇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಧ್ವಜವನ್ನು ಗೌರವಿಸುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟುದು ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As a matter of clarification, I never made any imputation or imputed any motive against anybody.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು.ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಇದು investigation ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಾಯಿನಾಡು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದಹಾಗೂ, ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದಹಾಗೂ, ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು resolution ಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಎಂತಹವರು ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Srirangapatna).—I rise to a point of order. How is the Hon'ble Member in order in trying to reply to a statement made by the Hon'ble Minister ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may say how it is admissible. In view of the facts stated by the Hon'ble Minister, I wanted to know whether he wanted to say anything. That is all.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದಮೇಲೆ ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಪರಿಚಯ ಗೊತ್ತಾದಮೇಲೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಯಾರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತನಿಖೆಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ specific ಆಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಅಗೌರವ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೆಂದು ಘಂಟಾಘೋಷವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In view of the statement made by the Hon'ble Minister, no useful purpose will be served by the Hon'ble House in discussing it. I therefore disallow the adjournment motion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ನಾರಾಯಣರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—(ಬಾಗೇಪಲ್ಲಿಗುಡಿಬಂಡೆ) ನಾನು ಒಂದು adjournment motion ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It was received in the office very late. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾಳೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ.

Sri R. K. PRASAD (Bangarpet).—I request you to give the ruling before the Opposition Leader starts making his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Imam will speak as Sri Mohamed Imam and not as Opposition Leader. Before I decide on that issue I want to hear him and then decide it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I am speaking as the Leader of the Opposition. Regarding that, I wanted to say myself. Since the Opposition has become the nightmare of Sri Prasad, I am glad he has raised that question. And I am glad you are going to set up a precedent. It is better that we discuss that matter. You may give me an opportunity and also to such of those who are anxious to take part in discussion on this important matter, and then you may give a decision. So you can fix a time for that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Shall we discuss it tomorrow?

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—Immediately after the question hour tomorrow, it is better that it is discussed.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Yes.

DISCUSSION ON STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION REPORT

Motion to consider (*contd.*)

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Yesterday, I spoke on the issue of Bellary question and I have given, I believe, cogent reasons as to why Bellary should not be separated from the State of Mysore. Sir, I must bring to the attention of the Government and this House one disquieting news we have received in connection with Bellary. We read in the Papers that the people of Bellary and round about have started Satyagraha and about 51 persons have been arrested and the Satyagraha is going to be continued indefinitely. Of course, this movement on their part shows their depth of feeling and their desire to be with Mysore and their desperate intention to achieve the object of retaining these taluks in Mysore. I am anxious that Government s ould